

Comment on “Nonzero Fermi Level Density of States for a Disordered d-Wave Superconductor in Two Dimensions” by K. Ziegler *et al.*

The paper by Ziegler *et al.* disputes the results for the density of states of disordered two dimensional superconductors whose order parameter has N nodes on the Fermi surface, obtained by Nersesyan *et al.* [2]. In this paper the problem was reduced to a problem of $(2 + 1)$ massless Dirac fermions in a quenched random gauge potential. Later it was established that such identification is valid only for $N = 1, 2$, while for $N = 4$ (d -wave pairing) the situation is more complicated [3], [4]. The problem of Dirac fermions in a random gauge field has also been considered by Ludwig *et al.* [5] (the Abelian disorder $N = 1$) and by Mudry *et al.* [6] (the non-Abelian disorder $N = 2$) who obtained the same results as we did, namely that independently of symmetry of the random gauge field (Abelian or non-Abelian) the density of states at zero energy vanishes.

Though we agree in principle that for $N = 4$ one may have a nonzero DOS at $E = 0$ (see the discussion in Ref. [4]), we do not think that arguments presented in Ref. 1 have any relevance to the problem we have studied. The starting point for our work was the perturbation theory result for the density of states at (DOS) at finite energies. If the scattering potential is weak, the perturbation expansion is essentially independent on whether one works on a lattice or in the continuous limit. The expansion contains logarithmic divergencies $\gamma^n (\ln E)^m$; in three dimensions leading logs can be summed giving a finite DOS at $E = 0$, but in two dimensions many extra logarithmic divergencies appear. All these logs become of order of one at $E < E_0 = \Delta \exp(-1/\gamma)$ signifying a crossover to strong coupling regime at $|E| \ll E_0$ [3]. To treat this regime we and the other authors suggested the nonperturbative approach. Whether one agrees with this approach or not, the principal fact of the existence of extra logarithmic divergencies in the expansion of DOS at $|E| \gg E_0$ cannot be disputed.

Now let us look at the principal formula of the paper [1] - Eq.(6), which should describe DOS at all energies. Taking $E \ll \Delta$ and calculating the integral yields

$$N(E) \sim \gamma \ln [\Delta^2 / (E^2 + \gamma^2)] + E \tan^{-1}(E/\gamma) \sim 2\gamma \ln[\Delta / \max(E, \gamma)] \quad (1)$$

At $E \gg \gamma$ the expansion of DOS contains just one logarithm – in a striking contrast with the perturbation theory! This is what should be expected because a Lorentz distribution of disorder, with all nonvanishing moments divergent, does not even allow to formulate a perturbation expansion. Ziegler *et al.* claim without explicit demonstration that they can use more general distributions. We challenge them to reproduce the perturbation theory result.

The discrepancy between Eq.(1) and the conventional perturbation theory suggests at the very least that models with Lorentzian and Gaussian disorder belong to different universality classes (and until explicit expressions for other distributions are available there is nothing to discuss). However, there may be more than that because similar discrepancies exist between the results obtained by this method for another model of disorder - $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional fermions with random mass [7]. This model has been used to describe the two dimensional Ising model with bond disorder. The results obtained within the field theory framework [8], [9] predict $\ln \ln(T - T_c)$ -singularity in the specific heat in excellent agreement with the computer simulation made for a system of 10^6 spins [10] (the Ziegler’s result was a constant specific heat). The

results for the correlation function averaged over the randomness [11], [12] also agree with the simulations [10].

We think that since the authors make the important claim which goes well beyond the argument against one particular result, but is aimed to debunk the entire field theoretical approach to disordered systems, they should clearly demonstrate that they are dealing with the same models and are using reliable methods. In our opinion, this has not been achieved in Ref. 1.

A.A.Nersesyan¹ and A.M.Tsvelik²

¹ International Centre for Theoretical Physics, P.O. Box 6586, 34100 Trieste, Italy, and Institute of Physics, Tamarashvili 6, 380077, Tbilisi, Georgia.

² Department of Physics, University of Oxford, 1 Keble Road, Oxford, OX1 3NP, United Kingdom.

PACS numbers: 74.25.Bt, 74.62.Dh

-
- [1] K. Ziegler, M. H. Hettler and P. J. Hirschfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3013 (1996).
[2] A. A. Nersesyan, A. M. Tsvelik and F. Wenger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2628 (1994).
[3] A. A. Nersesyan, A. M. Tsvelik and F. Wenger, Nucl. Phys. B**438**, 561 (1995).
[4] J.-S. Caux, I. I. Kogan and A. M. Tsvelik, Nucl. Phys. B**466**, (1996).
[5] A. W. W. Ludwig, M. P. A. Fisher, R. Shankar and G. Grinstein, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 7526 (1994).
[6] C. Mudry, C. Shamon and X.-G. Wen, Nucl. Phys. B**466**, 534 (1996).
[7] K. Ziegler, Nucl. Phys. B**344**, 499 (1990); Europhys. Lett. **14**, 415 (1991).
[8] V. Dotsenko and V. Dotsenko, Adv. Phys. **32**, 129 (1983).
[9] D. Bernard, hep-th/9509137.
[10] A. I. Talapov and L. N. Shchur, hep-th/9404011, hep-th/9404002.
[11] A. W. W. Ludwig, Nucl. Phys. B**330**, 639 (1990).
[12] R. Shenker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2466 (1987).